



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/513,350	02/25/2000	Frank Leymann	GE999-002	7891
7590	10/19/2004		EXAMINER	
Anne V Dougherty 3173 Cedar Road Yorktown Heights, NY 10598			JEANTY, ROMAIN	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3623	
DATE MAILED: 10/19/2004				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/513,350	LEYMANN ET AL.	
	Examiner Romain Jeanty	Art Unit 3623	<i>MJ</i>

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 November 2003.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.                            2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
    - a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
      1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
      2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
      3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                    | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____  |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____. | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
|   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.                                   |

**Detailed Action**

1. This communication is in response to the response filed 11/3/2003. Claims 1-16 are pending in the application.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-3 and 12-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being clearly anticipated by Du et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,041,306).

As per claims 1-2, 14-15 and 16, Du teaches:

A computerized workflow management system (abstract) utilizing a process model comprising 1 or more activities as nodes of a graph, with directed edges ("arrows") defining a potential control flow with process model (Du; fig 9 and col. 6, line 12 and col. 12, lines 61-66; comprising:

analyzing process model to determine assignment of priority execution indicator (Du; col. 13, lines 1-15; Du discloses checking a priority queue for requests at each state/activity); launching execution of the activity according to the to the priority execution indicator (Du; col. 7, lines 45-54; col. 9lines 13-20).

Art Unit: 3623

As per claim 2, Du further teaches a when said analyzing step indicates that there is a priority execution indicator, said workflow management system setting its own execution priority (col. 7, lines 45-54; col. 9, lines 13-20).

As per claim 3, Du further discloses setting the priority of one or more messages relating to the processing of said activity are set to the execution priority specified according to said priority execution indicator (i.e. setting the task priority in a queue table for the task execution) (col. 11, lines 52-60).

As per claim 12, Du further discloses execution of said activity directly by calling said activity with said execution priority (i.e. judging the task priority number and extracting the task for execution) (col. 7, lines 45-54; col. 9, lines 13-20).

As per claim 13, Du further discloses transmitting message “instruction” for the task to be executed. Note column col. 7, lines 45-5.

### **Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103**

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 4 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatented over Du as applied to claim 1 above in view of Dong et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,424,948).

As per claims 4 and 5, Du discloses assigning an activity indicator to an activity "task" (see claim 1 above), but Du fails to explicitly disclose a priority execution specification for the activity (See claim 1 above. Dong discloses a workflow comprising a priority execution specification (col. 27, lines 27-45). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have modified the workflow system of Du to include a priority execution specification as taught by Dong. The motivation being so that the behavior of a workflow system can be more easily analyzed and understood.

6. Claims 9, 10 and 11 are rejected 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Du as applied to claims 1, 2 and 3 above in view of Kraft, IV et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,867,160).

As to claims 9, 10 and 11, Du fails to explicitly disclose mapping said priority execution indicator to a value. Kraft, Iv et al, on the other hand, discloses a system that assigns priority to tasks and maps a priority execution indicator of the tasks using a mapping function (see abstract and col. 7, lines 49 through col. 9, lines 7-47). Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have modified the work flow system of Du by including a mapping priority indicator function as taught by Kraft, Iv et al. Doing so, would efficiently handle multiple tasks graphically in multitasking environments.

***Allowable Subject Matter***

7. Claims 6-8 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Art Unit: 3623

8. The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance:

Prior art of record taken or in combination fails to teach when there is no priority execution specifications of said activity, analyzing for a priority execution specification of a performance sphere comprising said activity, said performance sphere comprising a sub-graph of said process model associating a process executing indicator to activities within said performance.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed Romain Jeanty whose telephone number is (703) 308-9585. The examiner can normally be reached Monday-Thursday from 7:30 am to 6:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner are not successful, the examiner's supervisor, Tariq R Hafiz can be reached at (703) 305-9643.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1113.

Any response to this action should be mailed to Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks, Washington, D.C 20231  
or faxed to: (703) 305-7687

Hand delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park 5, 2451 Crystal Drive, Arlington VA, and seventh floor receptionist.

RJ

October 18, 2004

  
ROMAIN JEANTY  
PRIMARY EXAMINER  
